

**REMARKS**

Claims 18-34 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 18, 28 and 30 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution and during the December 3 personal interview; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection and suggestions made during the December 3 personal interview. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesy shown to Applicant's representative by Supervisory Examiner Dunn and Examiner Pritchett in the December 3, 2003 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

**I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects claims 18 and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. 10-229512 issued to Sakata in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,838,504 issued to Ichikawa. The Office Action rejects claims 19-21 and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sakata in view of Ichikawa and Japanese Patent

No. 07-082510 issued to Matsumoto. The Office Action also rejects claims 22-23 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sakata in view of Ichikawa and U.S. Patent No. 6,147,821 to Kadokura. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the December 3 personal interview, independent claims 18, 28 and 30 would define over the applied art provided the claims are further amended to clarify the internal reflection preventive means and the light absorbing means. Consistent with Supervisory Examiner Dunn's and Examiner Pritchett's suggestions, claims 18, 28 and 30 are amended. Specifically, claim 18 recites, *inter alia*, the internal reflection preventive means is "sufficiently sized" to cover at least a portion of the rear side of said prism and prevent stray light from entering the opposing left and right image signals. Similar language is also found in claims 28 and 30. These changes are believed to define over the applied art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections are respectfully requested.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 18-34 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Michael G. Harms  
Registration No. 51,780

JAO:MGH/hs

Date: March 9, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461